|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Members Present** |  | **Members Absent** |
| Mark Campbell, Chairman |  | None |
| Michael Chiodini, Vice-Chairman |  |  |
| Dick Gordon |  |  |
| Don Anderson |  |  |
| Adam Edelbrock |  |  |
| Chris Burton |  |  |
|  |  |  |

1. **Call of Meeting to Order and Approval of Minutes**

Chairman Mark Campbell called the meeting to order at 7:04 p.m.

Mr. Campbell stated for the record that Section 610.015 of the Missouri Sunshine Law provides that members of the Architectural Review Board who are not physically in the City Council Chambers can participate and vote on all matters when an emergency exists and the nature of the emergency is stated in the minutes.

The U.S. and the world is in a state of emergency due to the Coronavirus – COVID-19. Therefore, members of the Architectural Review Board have elected to participate in this meeting electronically for the public health and safety of each other and the general public.

Mr. Campbell stated that he was not in attendance at the last meeting and asked if there were any comments for the June 21, 2021 meeting minutes.

**Don Anderson made a motion to approve the June 21, 2021 minutes. Seconded by Dick Gordon. All ayes. Motion approved.**

1. **Sign Review - Old Business**

None

1. **Sign Review - New Business**
	1. 19-21S – 902 S Kirkwood Rd – I1

Chris Smith, Dale Sign Services, applicant

Wall Sign, Monument Sign & Driveway Signs for No Leash Required

Mr. Campbell introduced Case 19-21S. Chris Smith of Dale Sign Services addressed the board. Mr. Campbell indicated raceways are typically painted to match the material the sign is mounted to and wanted to know about the architectural perspective of the leash portion of the sign. Mr. Smith explained the leash is fabricated from aluminum, will be weaving in and out of the lettering, and will not be illuminated. Mr. Smith stated that the monument sign will be internally illuminated and will have a painted aluminum skirt. The signage will have internal conduit.

**Adam Edelbrock made a motion to approve Case 19-21S as submitted. Seconded by Dick Gordon. All ayes. Motion approved.**

* 1. 20-21S – 10463 Manchester Rd – B4
	Piros Signs, Inc., applicant
	Wall Signage and Menu Board for Chicken Out

Mr. Campbell introduced Case 20-21S. David Brand of Piros Signs addressed the board. Mr. Brand indicated the sign is composed of a raceway with illuminated channel lettering. The following items were discussed:

* The raceway will be painted to match the exterior cladding material.
* Returns should be consistent across the building.

**Dick Gordon made a motion to approve Case 20-21S as submitted with a cursory review of the menu board. Seconded by Adam Edelbrock. All ayes. Motion approved.**

1. **Residential Review - Old Business**
	1. Case 84-21R – 445 N Taylor Ave – R3

Mike Lewis, applicant

One-Story Addition

*Continued on 6-21-21 for additional information and 3-D renderings.*

Mr. Campbell introduced Case 84-21R. Mike Lewis of Lewis Homes addressed the board. Mr. Lewis explained that he had requested updated 3-D renderings of all sides of the proposed building to answer questions raised at last meeting. The following items were discussed:

* The porch railings should be consistent.
* The shutters and shutter proportion were discussed.
* It was verified that all window trim will be white and match on all sides.
* The transition of the roof lines, the roof crickets, and the over-frame were discussed.

**Michael Chiodini made a motion to approve Case 84-21R as submitted with the requirement that shutters on the front of the garage be appropriately sized or omitted. Seconded by Adam Edelbrock. Roll-call vote: Adam Edelbrock voted aye; Dick Gordon voted aye; Don Anderson voted nay; Chris Burton voted aye; Michael Chiodini voted aye; and Mark Campbell voted aye. Motion approved 5-1.**

* 1. Case 85-21R – 549 N Van Buren Ave – R4
	Nathan Rauh of Naismith-Allen, Inc., applicant
	Two-Story Addition

*Continued on 6-21-21 for additional information and updated elevations.*

Mr. Campbell introduced Case 85-21R. Hannah Tongay of Naismith-Allen addressed the board. Ms. Tongay indicated that they were considering bringing addition in by two inches on each side to provide a transition between the stucco on the existing structure and the siding on the proposed addition. The board discussed the following items:

* Maximum concrete exposure allowable on the foundation.
* The choice of siding for the exterior instead of stucco.
* Lattice or board-and-batten is needed to enclose the open area below the side stairs.
* The character of the proposed addition and the relation to the existing home should be considered when choosing material finishes. The board would like the project to utilize a material consistent with the time period of the original house, such as board-and-batten.
* Window sills on the addition should relate to the existing home.

**Don Anderson made a motion to continue Case 85-21R for additional information on siding changes and window trim. Seconded by Michael Chiodini. All ayes. Motion approved.**

* 1. Case 89-21R – 1007 Krauswood Dr – R3
	Robert & Maureen Reed, applicants
	Enclosing Existing Deck

*Continued on 6-21-21 for material cut sheets and a more detailed drawing.*

Mr. Campbell introduced Case 89-21R. Homeowner Maureen Reed addressed the board. Ms. Reed stated that they had resubmitted pictures and drawings with the intention of addressing concerns raised by the board at the previous meeting. The board discussed the following items:

* The roof slope and the warranty of the proposed roofing material. The roof pitch may need to be increased or a new roofing material such as a membrane or a standing seam metal roof may need to be used.
* The age of existing deck and the deck materials. Ms. Reed indicated the existing deck was built in 2000.
* The existing deck posts. Ms. Reed stated that the posts are solid wood 6x6s. The board requested that the columns have pedestal and cap components made of 1x trim.
* The windows should match the windows of the existing structure.

**Don Anderson made a motion to approve Case 89-21R with a cursory review of the roof material and the requirement that posts be trimmed at the top and bottom. Seconded by Dick Gordon. All ayes. Motion approved.**

* 1. Case 92-21R – 411 W Adams Ave – R4
	Michael Blaes, AIA, applicant
	New Single-Family Home

*Continued on 6-21-21 due to the applicant being unavailable to address the board.*

Mr. Campbell introduced Case 92-21R. Ben Ellerman of AIA addressed the board. The board discussed the single column on the back porch and explained that it seemed out of place. It was suggested that a vertical trim board be used to match the other side where the downspout is mounted to clean up the edge and define the space.

**Adam Edelbrock made a motion to approve Case 92-21R with the requirement that a vertical trim board be added to continue the visual of the porch. Seconded by Don Anderson. All ayes. Motion approved.**

1. **Residential Review - New Business**
	1. Case 52-21R – 555 N Clay Ave – R3

Jim Hotop, Coach House Garages, applicant

Detached Garage

Mr. Campbell introduced Case 52-21R. Jim Hotop of Coach House Garages addressed the board. Mr. Hotop stated that he is proposing a new detached garage that will have all windows and door trim to match the existing primary structure. Mr. Hotop also specified that they plan to use vinyl siding to match the primary structure and the roofing material will be black shingles. The board discussed the following items:

* Garage door selection and detail.
* The window details should have a vertical emphasis and be more characteristic of neighboring houses.

**Don Anderson made a motion to approve Case 52-21R with the requirement that the window trim and grids (if any) match the existing house and the garage door selection be submitted for cursory review. Seconded by Dick Gordon. All ayes. Motion approved.**

* 1. Case 96-21R – 473 Longfellow Ave – R4
	C.J. Moss, Chesterfield Fence & Deck, applicant
	Covered Deck Addition

Mr. Campbell introduced Case 96-21R. Charles Moss of Chesterfield Fence & Deck addressed the board. Mr. Moss indicated they are proposing to remove the existing deck and stairs and replace it with a new deck, landing, stairs, and gable roof centered on the existing smaller bay window. Mr. Moss also specified the roof will go over the smaller bay after the existing bay roof is removed. The board discussed the following items:

* The joint between the existing house and the addition.
* The proposed ceiling to the deck. Mr. Moss indicated it would be a 1:12, vaulted, flat, white vinyl ceiling with a ceiling fan.
* Siding in the gable end will match house as best as possible. It was suggested that cedar shake should be used to finish gable.
* Railing posts were discussed. It was determined that the posts go down to the ground. It was suggested that the posts be wrapped in vinyl and trimmed at the top and bottom to give them character.
* Structural headers should be returned around the building.

**Don Anderson made a motion to approve Case 96-21R with the requirement that the 2x12 header is added to all three sides; that the gable be finished with vinyl shake shingle; that the railing posts continue all the way through to the ground; and that the posts be trimmed with a cap and base. Seconded by Michael Chiodini. All ayes. Motion approved.**

* 1. Case 97-21R – 612 S Ballas Rd – R3
	MRM Manlin Development Group, applicant
	New Single-Family Residence

Mr. Campbell introduced Case 97-21R. Linda from MRM Manlin Development Group addressed the board. Linda indicated MRM Manlin Development Group is building new houses at neighboring properties on S Ballas. The board discussed the following items:

* The arc of the radius roof was discussed. It was suggested that the curve should start at a higher point, such as above the gutter line; should be grander and more dramatic; and should integrate a wing wall as opposed to the proposed double columns.
* Shutter coverage was brought up. It was indicated that shutters should be half the width of the windows. The windows can be trimmed out in lieu of shutters.
* The window grid pattern should be consistent throughout the home.

**Don Anderson made a motion to approve Case 97-21R with the requirement that the window grids match; the roof arc be accentuated and a wall be added below the arc; and a cursory review of the concrete foundation exposure at the front of the house. Seconded by Chris Burton. All ayes. Motion approved.**

* 1. Case 98-21R – 616 S. Ballas Rd –R3
	MRM Manlin Development Group, applicant
	New Single-Family Residence

Mr. Campbell introduced Case 98-21R. Linda from MRM Manlin Development Group continued addressing the board. The board discussed the following items:

* The shutters were addressed. It was specified that the windows could be trimmed out in lieu of shutters.
* It was determined that the window grid patterns need to match all around.
* The band board should continue around to the back and the recommendation for using a vinyl band board was made.

**Don Anderson made a motion to approve Case 98-21R with the requirement that the shutters be removed; the band board be continued all around; and, a cursory review of the concrete foundation exposure at the front of the house. Seconded by Dick Gordon. All ayes. Motion approved.**

* 1. Case 99-21R – 315 Crest Ave –R4
	Kingbridge Homes LLC, applicant
	New Single-Family Residence

Mr. Campbell introduced Case 99-21R. John Sulthouse of Kingbridge Homes addressed the board. Mr. Sulthouse indicated he had chosen the stone height for the wainscoting be the proposed 48” height because of aesthetic preference. The board discussed the following items:

* The lack of articulation on the left elevation was discussed. A band board was suggested to be used to break up the monotony of the left side. It was indicated the band board should be continued around the house.
* The gutter and downspout location was questioned. Mr. Sulthouse stated the downspouts would be running down the porch columns and empty onto grade. It was recommended that the overhang of the porch roof be reduced by half to accommodate the gutters and that spitters be used in place of the proposed downspouts.

**Don Anderson made a motion to approve Case 99-21R with the following requirements: that the porch overhang be made smaller; that a band board be put around both sides of house to break up the expanse of the side elevations; and, that the front gutters have spitters instead of downspouts. Seconded by Chris Burton. All ayes. Motion approved.**

* 1. Case 100-21R – 918 Cleveland Ave – R4
	Lakeside Renovation and Design, applicant
	1 ½ Story Rear Home Addition

Mr. Campbell introduced Case 100-21R. Charles Nigh of Lakeside Renovation and Design addressed the board. Mr. Nigh indicated the project is a proposal for a 1-1/2 story rear addition that would allow the homeowners to age in place where they raised their family. Mr. Nigh stated that the addition would include a rear side, lower-level garage with master suite above. The board discussed the following items:

* The scale of the addition compared to the existing home. It was opined that the addition should not be taller than the existing structure.
* The radius of the driveway may not allow ease of access to the garage. Mr. Nigh indicated the driveway is shared and the garage is set back from the left side. He also indicated there is shared use of the pad between the two houses.
* A more integrated and thoughtful solution is needed to expand the house while also relating to the existing house.

**Dick Gordon made a motion to continue Case 100-21R. Seconded by Adam Edelbrock. All ayes. Motion approved.**

* 1. Case 101-21R – 438 Greenleaf Dr – R3
	Jared Byers, applicant
	Screened Porch and Rear Home Addition

Mr. Campbell introduced Case 101-21R. The applicant and homeowner were not present to address the board.

**Don Anderson made a motion to continue Case 101-21R. Seconded by Michael Chiodini. All ayes. Motion approved.**

1. **Commercial Review - Old Business**

None

1. **Commercial Review - New Business**

None

1. **Election of Officers**

Mr. Campbell introduced the proposal of the election of officers.

**Mr. Chiodini made a motion to keep the board members as-is. Seconded by Don Anderson. All ayes. Motion approved.**

Ms. Yancey informed the board that the next meeting on July 19, 2021 will be in-person at City Hall. The Work Session format will be addressed at the next Work Session meeting. Mr. Anderson asked about submissions not being complete when submitted and Mr. Schenck advised that the Architectural Review Board is an advisory board to help applicants along in the building design process.

Mr. Campbell adjourned the meeting at 9:19 p.m.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|   |  |
|  | Mark Campbell, Chairman |
|  |  |
|  | Michael Chiodini, Vice-chairman |

Upon request, these minutes can be made available within three working days in an alternate format, such as a CD, by calling 314-822-5822. Minutes can also be downloaded from the City’s website at [www.kirkwoodmo.org](http://www.kirkwoodmo.org), then click on City Clerk, Boards & Commissions, Architectural Review Board.